

BREADTUBE IS DEAD. LONG LIVE ANARCHY!

I. THE STATE OF BREADTUBE TODAY

Whether it's Vaush completely fortress-walling himself and no longer interacting with other creators to debate him on stream, ContraPoints getting completely burnt out from the online left and no longer calling herself a BreadTuber, InnuendoStudios going 100K into debt because he didn't know he had to pay taxes, or leftist theory channels stagnating in subscribers, getting 1/30th of the views of their subscriber count due to repeated talking points, discussions, and topics, the consensus is clear: BreadTube is no longer developing and bringing new or fresh ideas to the table, and you can see this in how the leftist content that gets the most views is whatever REACTS to this current form of society and its events, which is why we see the continued popularity of streamers like Hasan and Vaush, and in reaction content makers like Klavernacle and ThoughtSlime, the last 3 of which have struggled to maintain viewership as they used to.

Importantly, this reaction based content is fundamentally the same model of conservative content online. Contrast this to how the *butter* of **BreadTube** was its video essays. People will still click on video essays about media they like, but if the political video essay isn't developing or furthering ideas in a unique way, nobody will watch it. When a space stops producing new ideas, it shifts to reacting to events instead of shaping them.

Breadtube has grown to max capacity within its echo-chambers. The meteoric rise is gone, and all that's left is petty discussion. BreadTube is an extremely insular environment, with the focus being on what makes their Patreon supporters happy. At best, you can consider this a focus on artistry. At worst? Audience capture.

II. BREADTUBE'S FLAWED CONCEPTION OF ANARCHISM

Anarchism is **ESPECIALLY** not "being against all */unjust/* hierarchies". What would justify that hierarchy? Another justified hierarchy? Furthermore, as I've seen done by other leftist YouTubers, is the framing of anarchism as "being against all hierarchies". "Being against all hierarchies" doesn't *mean* anything. You'd have to specify "hierarchies of power", which, again, just means authority. Framing anarchism as "being against all hierarchies" also frames anarchism as being inherently about egalitarianism. It is not. Likewise, you get people who characterize Anarchism as "being against all forms of domination and oppression" without defining either term. Defining anarchism as being "against domination" is what leads to people attempting to use BDSM out of all things as an argument against Anarchism. I don't use loaded terms like "domination", "oppression", or "hierarchies" because not only do these terms not sound serious to anybody who isn't a leftist, they are also harder to define.

Framing anarchism in these ways obscures the actual definition of anarchism: a political philosophy against all forms of authority. **Authority is the social legitimization of rulership.** Anarchism is a fight against rulership. The truth is that Anarchism isn't inherently about equality. The existence of inequalities among individuals and their characteristics (beauty, IQ, etc) does not justify authority anyhow. Some people are innately going to have more social opportunities than others, and equality of outcome is something that has to be forced upon people. It's not that equality is a leftist add-on to Anarchism, as I AM aware of the debate that

Marx had with Bakunin on equality, it's that leftists through their rhetoric almost entirely collapse Anarchism into this frame of equality being the main focus.

Another problem with the framing of anarchism on BreadTube is this notion that anarchism is against all authority (which is correct) AND that Anarchism is against all "justifying dogmas" of authority, you can see an example of this in a video made by Andrewism. Can you even define "justifying dogmas"? The truth is that you can't. Even Anarchism as an ideology itself could be used as a dogma to justify ruling over others.

There are certain algorithmic pressures that have led to what I call "The BreadTube pipeline". You start off as a socially progressive liberal, caring a lot about others, even to the detriment of yourself (which is not inherently a bad thing). You get recommended more and more anti-capitalist content, with similar framing on empathy. Eventually, you get recommended explicitly communist and anarchist videos. Anarchism is very attractive to liberals through this pipeline. You don't have to deal with the burden of the USSR's legacy from calling yourself a communist outright, it's an easy way to mark yourself as a radical, and you still get to keep your wholesome chungus progressivism. You're not going to get banned off of YouTube for being an anarchist unless you explicitly advocate for terrorism (which I may or may not have done prior). You are instead far more likely to get banned off of YouTube if you promote "National Socialism". Simply put, Anarchism is the path of least resistance for people getting into radical politics. Through this pipeline, Anarchism has become "safe edgy".

The radical online left is split into two main camps: Marxism-Leninism and Anarcho-communism. Anarcho-communism online has become somewhat of a joke, focusing on social progressivism first, espousing the feel-good values of trans-rights, anti-racism, feminism, etc.. that George Soros would approve of. "Trans rights are human rights" but who is going to tell the newbie ancoms that the state is needed to enforce rights? The mainstream anarcho-communist position is an untenable one. It doesn't appeal to anybody outside of this subsection of the BreadTube ideological bubble.

Yes, I have different opinions than most current Western ancoms on race relations, feminism, sex transition, and other social issues. I'm against all forms of authority, so I'm an anarchist. Saying that anarchism is inherently in support of feminism, sex transition, multi-culturalism, or whatever, is a belief that traps Breadtube into a thick echo-chamber. The moment you're afraid to respond to a video with intellectual honesty because it'd be "platforming" transphobia, is the moment you asphyxiate your chance of not preaching to choir. BreadTube has reduced anarchism to a left-wing egalitarian identity, but anarchism is better understood as a rejection of authority, not a demand for equality.

BreadTube promotes a certain set of key values, including but not limited to: Empathy, fairness, diversity, equality, tolerance, and inclusivity. These are not inherently harmful values, especially empathy. I do like the BreadTube emphasis on Empathy. Empathy in my opinion is the best value out of this list. However, these BreadTube values are NOT an objective set of values for people to live by. In my opinion, (and I can make a video about this), Honor, Beauty, Strength, and Excellence should be your primary set of values so you can accomplish something truly great. Similarly, I have noticed that leftist rhetoric attempts to paint leftism as having a monopoly on empathy. That empathy is *the* leftist value. This is a mistake. No political side owns any virtue. Saying that leftists are more empathetic is like saying that right-wingers are stronger and more attractive. In reality, the left should embrace strength and beauty as virtues, and the cultural right should embrace empathy. It would benefit ALL involved.

The BreadTube values should be a secondary set for the sake of temperance, which **is** important. I am not a social anarchist. I know many anarchist movements in the past have focused more on equality directly as a goal. I am an individualist anarchist. An extremely underrepresented form of anarchism, especially online. Do not show me anarcho-feminist protests and imply that I am wrong for not being a feminist. I embrace anarchy for myself. Saying that anarchism is **inherently** about equality neglects the rich tradition of individualist anarchism. This isn't to say that Anarchism is purely defined in the negative. Free association, mutual aid, and horizontal methods of organizing are anarchist values as well, it's just that anarchism at its very core is a rejection of all authority.

This all means that BreadTube has **selected for a certain type of anarchism** while misrepresenting it, and filtered out other kinds of anarchism.

III. ON “LEFT UNITY”

You can loosely define right-wing ideology as being in support of the current society, or of what used to be the current society and wanting to go back to that. Which is why both Monarchism and MAGA are right-wing. Likewise, you can loosely define left-wing ideology as being against the current thing in hopes of reaching a new stage of society. Hence, why liberalism used to be left-wing and why Marxist Communism is also left-wing. Under this view, Anarchism is marked as a left-wing ideology. But this is a mistake.

Anarchism is framed relative to Marxism on Breadtube as having the same core beliefs on capitalism, but only differing on the “state question” so they can still be friends. What leftists don't realize is that if you read Fascist texts, you'd realize that this statement on Marxism would apply to Fascism as well. The truth is that any form of far left and far right ideology that supports the existence of authority, is far closer to each other than either is to Anarchy.

Here's the thing: Anarchism needs to split from the left. Yes, Anarchism has historical roots in leftism, with Anarchists being present with Marxists in the first Internationale, I know. Yes, anarchism can't be right-wing either. Anarchism fighting among the “left” is a MISTAKE that comes from history, and we can correct it. Perhaps shockingly, I firmly believe that Marxism-Leninism should become the predominant form of leftism. If you look at BreadTube videos, including a lot of content made by presupposed anarchists, you won't find much of a focus on anti-capitalism. There is a disproportionate emphasis on queerness as an identity. This is a mistake. What made the left so powerful WAS its focus on anti-capitalism. The only strain of leftism that refuses the culture war and focuses on anti-capitalism is Marxism-Leninism.

When you think about *why* people choose to become Marxist Leninists, it's not because they were deeply thinking about whether the state is the product of class antagonisms, and how the state will wither away once class distinctions are abolished. It's because they *deeply* care about geopolitics, which explains all the country flags in their twitter usernames. Marxist Leninists care MOST for the “uncritical” support of what they deem to be “people's movements”, basically, anything that opposes US global hegemony. Marxist Leninists are people who care the **most** about opposing US global hegemony while thinking that negating all authority isn't realistic or isn't worthwhile. This is a more tenable position to become mainstream within leftist circles than the negation of all authority.

Secondly, the truth is that most people care about being on the “right” side of history, and having the “right” opinion, more than they care about their own ability to not be a slave and to create their own values. Anarchists, especially anarcho-communists, are simply NOT going to win the “propaganda war” against Marxist Leninists because they are fighting in the same fundamentally leftist frame of ‘revolution’ and ‘equality’ (see, Anark vs BadEmpanada).

The overwhelming majority of people who fight for ‘equality’ as a political goal, would rather have the state make them equal. Even though anarchists know the state itself creates inequalities, the truth is that the state CAN have an equalizing effect on the ruled subjects through welfare programs, rent control, UBI, other social safety nets, and so on. These policies impact people’s day to day life, so most left-wing people would rather focus on these things. For people to care about anarchy as an ideal, you’d have to prove how embracing anarchy improves their day to day life. I will make a video essay on the joyful refusal of authority!

For revolution, simply put, it is far more likely that the ACP becomes a main political party, than the US, or any country, somehow restructuring itself from the ground up to become Anarchy. A Marxist Leninist vanguard style revolution is **plausible** but not impossible. Making the state useless entirely? Not plausible for the entirety of the US, except for certain areas where the government can’t enforce its rule well. Anarchy is mostly impossible. You know which one is easier, and people choose the path of least resistance.

IV. CRITIQUE OF SOLARPUNK

Solarpunk is not a goal to strive towards. You cannot create solar panels without the inherently authoritarian global supply chains it takes to make them. Nobody is going to create skyscrapers by choice. You want the comforts of capitalism but without the inherently coercive structures required to make those comforts. That’s not possible. Nobody is going to be CHOOSING to slave away in a mine to gather the ore needed for solar panels, and nobody is going to CHOOSE to do the back-breaking labor all day to make skyscrapers.

I can understand AN argument for Solarpunk, through the framework of separating small-scale anarchy from large-scale anarchy. I discussed why *large*-scale anarchy will never happen in my “WHY POLITICS HAS NO ANSWER” video, because simply put, industrial capitalism is REQUIRED to keep 8+ BILLION people on Earth. The overwhelming majority of people understand this, and hence, Solarpunk is easily seen as a quack dream. However, small-scale anarchy is POSSIBLE, in various forms. Anarcho-communists will typically use the examples of the CNT FAI and of the free territory of Ukraine. Yes, those didn’t last long, but that’s not the point. Anarchy, a society where you’re not a slave, is worth fighting for anyways. If Solarpunks grab a portion of a city for themselves, kick out cops, and grow gardens on top of buildings, go for it. It won’t last longer than a few years, but I think it’s still worth fighting for regardless if you really believe in Solarpunk as an ideal.

The thing is, this attempt to create a separate aesthetic identity for anarchists online is a GOOD thing. I can imagine a colorful, airy, playful aesthetic reminiscent of Studio Ghibli as a way to represent social anarchism and what it stands for. I RESPECT what Solarpunk **tries** to do. It’s just that I know I can create a far better, darker aesthetic.

V. ON ANARCHISM AND REACTION

The idea of “left unity” on BreadTube is flawed, because it doesn’t go far enough. Anarchists think Stalinists online are the “enemy” but still interact? Good. We need “unity” (in quotation marks) with “reactionaries” online as well. “Reactionaries” must see anarchist content, and vice versa. It's not platforming fascists. They already have a platform. It's making tunnels between all of the political platforms so they can interact. I’m going to make the algorithms merge, so Marxists, Fascists, and anybody else (SocDems, Liberals, etc...) will see how similar they really are. This has to be done. I am uploading videos I have already made to elaborate on how this must be done soon. Technically, this raises the intellectual stakes for all of us because through the algorithms merging EVERYONE’s opinions will be challenged more. May the best ideas win. I know my anarchist ones will.

There is something known as “national anarchism”, which is the unsuccessful fascist creep in anarchist spaces. Rest assured, I would be considered its rival.

I'm the anarchist creep in fascist spaces, who can say: Yes, that problem in society is real, that ANALYSIS has truth to it, but nothing justifies authority. That's far more dangerous to fascism, conservatism, neoliberalism, or any other reactionary ideology than allowing their ideas to fester in echo-chambers. Fascist spaces do not become less fascist by being left alone. They become less stable when confronted by a calm anarchist who refuses their premises and makes their contradictions visible.